



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,241	09/18/2000	Eric M. Silberstein	IDIK-001; 55692-012	4412
23550	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC 3 E-COMM SQUARE ALBANY, NY 12207			MANIWANG, JOSEPH R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,241

Applicant(s)

SILBERSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph R. Maniwang

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/10/05 has been entered.

Priority

2. This application claims benefit to provisional application 60/163,781 filed 11/05/1999.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. "A system for managing website content, the system comprising: means for managing an abstraction layer...; means for managing a set of object links...; means for receiving a modification of data...; means for obtaining an object link...; means for

Art Unit: 2144

determining the target content object...; and means for updating data..." as recited in claim 38 and "A system for managing website content, the system comprising: means for managing a set of projects...; means for managing a set of project links...; means for managing a set of object links...; means for creating a new source content object...; means for automatically generating a new target content object...; and means for automatically generating a new object link..." as recited in claim 45 is non-statutory, since it is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable as the only hardware is in an intended use statement. This is true even if the various recited means include hardware, since it is the intent of the execution of the system and not the system itself that includes such hardware.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 38, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), hereinafter referred to as Challenger.

Art Unit: 2144

7. Regarding claims 26, 38, and 42, Challenger disclosed a method and system comprising managing an abstraction layer that maps data for a plurality of content objects (see column 8, lines 3-10), each of which comprises one of a plurality of resource types (see column 10, lines 17-20), wherein the abstraction layer comprises a uniform structure for mapping the data for each of the plurality of content objects regardless of the corresponding resource type (see column 14, lines 58-63); managing a set of object links that interfaces with the abstraction layer, wherein each object link comprises a source content object, a target content object, and one of a plurality of object link types (see column 8, lines 30-42); receiving a modification of data for the source content object for a source website (see column 8, lines 36-40); obtaining an object link for the source content object from the set of object links (see column 8, lines 40-42); determining the target content object based on the object link (see column 8, lines 40-42); and updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the source content object and the object link type for the object link (see column 9, lines 18-28).

8. Regarding claim 27, Challenger disclosed the method and system including ensuring that a resource type for the source content object and a resource type for the target content object are the same (see column 8, lines 51-65); and copying the data from the source content object to the target content object based on the resource type (see column 8, lines 51-65).

9. Regarding claim 30, Challenger disclosed the method and system further comprising obtaining a second object link from the set of object links for the

Art Unit: 2144

target content object; determining a second target content object based on the second object link; and updating data for the second target content object based on the updated data for the target content object and an object link type for the second object link (see column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 7).

10. Regarding claim 34, Challenger disclosed the method and system further comprising generating the object link for the source content object (see column 7, lines 38-51).

11. Regarding claims 35 and 41, Challenger disclosed the method and system further comprising generating the target content object based on the source content object and the object link, wherein the target content object inherits at least one property from the source content object (see column 9, lines 18-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 28, 29, 31-33, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), hereinafter referred to as Challenger, and further in view of Lakritz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529).

14. Challenger disclosed a method and system comprising managing an abstraction layer that maps data for a plurality of content objects (see column 8,

Art Unit: 2144

lines 3-10), each of which comprises one of a plurality of resource types (see column 10, lines 17-20), wherein the abstraction layer comprises a uniform structure for mapping the data for each of the plurality of content objects regardless of the corresponding resource type (see column 14, lines 58-63); managing a set of object links that interfaces with the abstraction layer, wherein each object link comprises a source content object, a target content object, and one of a plurality of object link types (see column 8, lines 30-42); receiving a modification of data for the source content object for a source website (see column 8, lines 36-40); obtaining an object link for the source content object from the set of object links (see column 8, lines 40-42); determining the target content object based on the object link (see column 8, lines 40-42); and updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the source content object and the object link type for the object link (see column 9, lines 18-28).

15. While Challenger disclosed updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the source content object and the object link type for the object link, Challenger did not specifically disclose an object link type comprising a translate link for performing a workflow to translate source data into a different language for the target content object.

16. In a related art of web content delivery, Lakritz disclosed a method and system comprising a source and target object (see column 2, lines 38-43) translated into another language through a translation link (see column 9, lines 44-47) using a workflow (see column 4, lines 64-67; column 9, line 51; column 11, lines 17-23). Lakritz further disclosed sending a notification of a required

Art Unit: 2144

translation to a user (see column 2, lines 32-34; column 6, lines 3-6) and receiving confirmation that the required translation step has been completed (see column 9, lines 44-57; column 10, lines 5-10).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Challenger and Lakritz to provide a system for translating a source content object into another language for a target content object as claimed. The invention of Challenger generally provided a way to modify a target object through a link to a source object. Lakritz further disclosed using such links as a way to translate the source object into another language. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider incorporating the teachings of Lakritz as they provided a more compact, efficient, and easy way to provide document localization (see column 5, lines 19-33).

18. Claims 36, 37, 39, 40, and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), hereinafter referred to as Challenger, and further in view of Lakritz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529).

19. Challenger disclosed a method and system comprising managing an abstraction layer that maps data for a plurality of content objects (see column 8, lines 3-10), each of which comprises one of a plurality of resource types (see column 10, lines 17-20), wherein the abstraction layer comprises a uniform structure for mapping the data for each of the plurality of content objects regardless of the corresponding resource type (see column 14, lines 58-63); managing a set of object links that interfaces with the abstraction layer, wherein

Art Unit: 2144

each object link comprises a source content object, a target content object, and one of a plurality of object link types (see column 8, lines 30-42); receiving a modification of data for the source content object for a source website (see column 8, lines 36-40); obtaining an object link for the source content object from the set of object links (see column 8, lines 40-42); determining the target content object based on the object link (see column 8, lines 40-42); and updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the source content object and the object link type for the object link (see column 9, lines 18-28).

20. While Challenger disclosed managing a set of object links that interfaces with the abstraction layer, Challenger did not specifically disclose the use of project links.

21. In a related art of web content delivery, Lakritz disclosed a method and system for translating a source content object into another language for a target content object, the translation of several objects handled by project links (see column 10, lines 40-65).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Challenger and Lakritz to provide a system for updating website content comprising managing a set of projects and project links. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider incorporating the teachings of Lakritz as they provided a more compact, efficient, and easy way to provide document localization (see column 5, lines 19-33). The invention of Lakritz also provided fully automated management of the translation

Art Unit: 2144

process, thus removing much of the burden placed on users of the system (see column 13, lines 1-5).

Response to Arguments

23. Examiner acknowledges Applicant's amendment to the Specification, Figures, and claims. Examiner submits that the limitations of the newly amended claims are taught by the prior art as detailed in the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Amith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,337)

Freivald et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,219,818)

Yoden et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0007383)

Beurket et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,666)

Degenaro et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,725,333)

Lakritz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,526,426)

Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,712)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R. Maniwang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3928. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2144

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER